

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/810,037	03/26/2004	Matthew A. Purdy	2000.113500	8441	
23720	7590 10/02/2006		EXAMINER		
	S, MORGAN & AMER	DUNCAN, MARC M			
HOUSTON,	MOND, SUITE 1100 TX 77042		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2113		
		•	DATE MAIL ED 10/02/200	,	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary			10/810,037	PURDY, MATTI	HEW A.	
			Examiner	Art Unit		
			Marc Duncan	2113		
	The MAILING DATE of this commu	nication appea	ars on the cover sheet	with the correspondence	address	
Period fo						
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Manisons of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come period for reply is specified above, the maximum is to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DAT s of 37 CFR 1.136(munication. tatutory period will y will, by statute, ca	(a). In no event, however, may apply and will expire SIX (6) Mause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	o	
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>26 Mar</i>	rch 2004			
2a)□			ction is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition	<i>,</i> —		atters, prosecution as to t	he merits is	
,	closed in accordance with the pract		•	·		
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the	application.	1			
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	* *	from consideration.			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		,			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-18 and 20-27</u> is/are	rejected.			•	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) 6 and 19 is/are objected to	-				
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or e	election requirement.			
Applicati	on Papers				•	
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.				
'	The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 March 20</u>		⊠ accepted or b)□ o	biected to by the Examin	er.	
,	Applicant may not request that any obje			·		
•	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t	o by the Exar	miner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form I	PTO-152.	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority					
	2. Certified copies of the priority			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
	3. Copies of the certified copies	, ,		en received in this Nationa	al Stage	
• •	application from the Internation	•	• • • •	-A b d		
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action	on for a list of	the certified copies no	ot received.		
				•		
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) 🛛 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			v Summary (PTO-413)		
_	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I	PTO-948)		o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application		
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other: _			

Art Unit: 2113

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-18, 20-21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Satya et al. (6,751,519).

Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satya in view of Atkinson et al. (2004/0029029).

Claims 6 and 19 are objected to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-18, 20-21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Satya et al. (6,751,519).

Regarding claim 1:

Satya teaches:

receiving fault classification data associated with a fault condition (col. 4 lines 47-53 and lines 64-67); and

Art Unit: 2113

estimating at least one yield parameter based on the fault classification data (col.

Page 3

4 lines 64-67).

Regarding claim 2:

Satya teaches:

wherein estimating the at least one yield parameter further comprises estimating

an overall yield parameter (col. 5 lines 14-16 and col. 7 line 65-col. 8 line 2).

Regarding claim 3:

Satya teaches:

wherein estimating the overall yield parameter further comprises estimating a

number of die lost (col. 7 line 65-col. 8 line 2 – estimating final wafer yield inherently

includes estimating a number of die lost).

Regarding claim 4:

Satya teaches:

wherein estimating the overall yield parameter further comprises estimating a

percentage of die lost (col. 7 line 65-col. 8 line 2 – the number of dice are known. If a

final yield is estimated, simply dividing the estimated final yield by the total gives the

percentage).

Regarding claim 5:

Art Unit: 2113

Satya teaches:

wherein estimating the at least one yield parameter further comprises estimating a performance yield parameter (col. 11 lines 12-47 – estimating failure probability clearly reads on a performance parameter prediction).

Regarding claim 7:

Satya teaches:

wherein estimating the at least one yield parameter further comprises associating at least one estimated yield parameter with a fault class specified by the fault classification data (col. 4 lines 64-67 and col. 12 lines 17-36).

Regarding claim 8:

Satya teaches:

determining an actual yield parameter for a wafer (col. 8 lines 61-66); and updating the estimated yield parameter based on the actual yield parameter (col. 8 lines 61-66).

Regarding claim 10:

Satya teaches:

further comprising scrapping a wafer associated with the fault condition responsive to the estimated yield parameter being outside a predetermined range (col. 8 lines 38-44).

Art Unit: 2113

Regarding claim 11:

Satya teaches:

determining process/step data associated with the fault condition (col. 7 line 65-col. 8 line 2); and

Page 5

estimating at least one yield parameter based on the fault classification data and the process/step data (col. 7 line 65-col. 8 line 2).

Regarding claim 12:

Satya teaches:

further comprising estimating a plurality of yield parameters based on the fault classification data and the process/step data (col. 7 line 65-col. 8 line 2).

Regarding claim 13:

Satya teaches:

further comprising estimating a plurality of yield parameters based on the fault classification data (col. 7 line 65-col. 8 line 2).

Regarding claims 14-18, 20-21 and 23-27:

The claims are rejected as the systems for performing the methods of claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-13.

Art Unit: 2113

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satya in view of Atkinson et al. (2004/0029029).

Regarding claims 9 and 22:

The teachings of Satya are outlined above.

Satya does not explicitly teach removing a process tool associated with a fault condition from service if the estimated yield parameter is outside a predetermined range. Satya does, however, teach taking necessary measures if an estimated yield parameter is outside a predetermined range.

Atkinson teaches removing a process tool associated with a fault condition from service if the estimated yield parameter is outside a predetermined range (paragraph 0026).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the tool shutdown procedure of Atkinson with the manufacturing process of Satya.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the combination because Atkinson teaches that shutting down a process tool avoids problems that threaten multiple lots of wafers (paragraph 0026).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Duncan whose telephone number is 571-272-3646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on 571-272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,037 Page 8

Art Unit: 2113

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

md